

COMMENT LETTER # 9

DAN & JEANINE STILES

We attended the open meeting at the Shingle Springs Firefighters Memorial Hall on June 7, 2006 and asked questions regarding the interchange. Questions that we had which remain unanswered is how traffic will be regulated on and off the freeway.

1

What controls will Cal Trans have to prevent vehicle traffic (and subsequent air pollution) from exceeding your design specifications (other than "monitoring")?

2

What plans does Cal Trans have if the traffic exceeds the current design specifications of the interchange?

3

We're also concerned that the interchange is in close proximity to other, existing interchanges. What will Cal Trans do to prevent congestion between these three interchanges?

4

Considering the added vehicle congestion, increased air pollution and road signage, we stand in opposition to the construction of the Shingle Springs interchange.

5

Respectfully,

Dan and Jeanine Stiles

COMMENT LETTER #9 RESPONSE

Comment Letter #9 – Dan & Jeanine Stiles

9-1. The commenter asks how traffic will be regulated on and off of Highway 50. The Interchange Project's traffic analysis is beyond the scope of the Court of Appeal's ruling, having been litigated and decided previously in favor of Caltrans by both the trial court and the Court of Appeal. Accordingly, it is beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR and need not be considered further. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the Interchange Project includes installing metering signals on the on-ramps from the interchange to Highway 50 and an auxiliary lane on Highway 50 to mitigate impacts from Interchange Project traffic leaving and entering the highway. See 2002 Draft EIR at pp.5.4-28–5.4-37.

9-2. The commenter asks how Caltrans will prevent vehicle traffic from exceeding design specifications. Again, this is beyond the scope of the Court of Appeal's ruling, and therefore beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR.

Caltrans cannot prevent traffic from exceeding design specifications because it cannot regulate the hotel and casino. However, the interchange is designed to handle more traffic than is projected to occur from the hotel and casino because the interchange cannot be made any smaller than one lane in each direction. Accordingly, Caltrans does not anticipate that traffic will exceed design specifications within the design period.

9-3. The commenter asks what plans Caltrans has for the event that traffic does exceed design specifications. This is beyond the scope of the Court of Appeal's ruling, and therefore beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR. As explained above, Caltrans determined that it is unlikely that traffic will exceed design specifications. 2002 EIR at Section 5.4. Also, the project includes mitigation measures for impacts caused by traffic using the interchange. See Response 9-1, above.

9-4. The commenter asks what Caltrans will do to prevent congestion between the Rancheria interchange and the interchanges to its east and west. Again, this is beyond the scope of the Court of Appeal's ruling, and therefore beyond the scope of the Supplemental EIR. Caltrans has required mitigation, which the 2002 Final EIR demonstrates will maintain acceptable levels of service. See Response 9-1, above.

9-5. The commenter states opposition to the Interchange Project. Caltrans acknowledges the commenter's opinion, and will consider this opinion as part of the record relating to its decision on the Interchange Project.